

Message

**From:** Lazos, Pamela [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=15D4F11C6327474BB424A24CBD406E93-PLAZOS]  
**Sent:** 7/19/2021 3:26:47 PM  
**To:** Reinfeld, Aviva [Reinfeld.Aviva@epa.gov]; Rivera, Nina [Rivera.Nina@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: issues blurb for the RA July issues paper

Oh, great. So Allison used the WAR item? Also, can you send me a copy? And thank you for doing that!

---

**From:** Reinfeld, Aviva <Reinfeld.Aviva@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 19, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** Lazos, Pamela <Lazos.Pamela@epa.gov>; Rivera, Nina <Rivera.Nina@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: issues blurb for the RA July issues paper

I thought we could double-count our WAR description for this—I asked Allison and she said we could use the same text for both, though I don't know if that means we need to submit it separately?

---

**From:** Lazos, Pamela <Lazos.Pamela@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 19, 2021 10:35 AM  
**To:** Rivera, Nina <Rivera.Nina@epa.gov>; Reinfeld, Aviva <Reinfeld.Aviva@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: issues blurb for the RA July issues paper

Oops! This got lost in the sauce because I was out much of Thursday and didn't see it on my tickler system. Does it still need to be done? I can draft something after docket. Sorry!

---

**From:** Rivera, Nina <Rivera.Nina@epa.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 08, 2021 8:10 PM  
**To:** Lazos, Pamela <Lazos.Pamela@epa.gov>; Reinfeld, Aviva <Reinfeld.Aviva@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** issues blurb for the RA July issues paper

The blurbs are due on July 15. Can one of you work on drafting a short blurb on Name sensitive based on revised scope and send it to Donna by then? I know Pam has done these several times, and I think Aviva has too, but just in case here are a couple of examples:

- **US and PADEP do not concur with Environmental Integrity Project's (EIP) Motion to Intervene in negotiations to amend Partial Consent Decree (PDC) with Capital Region Water (CRW):** EIP contacted DOJ and PADEP regarding the potential filing of a Motion to Intervene in the matter of U.S. v. Capital Regional Water and the City of Harrisburg, where the parties are currently negotiating an amendment to the Partial Consent Decree. On April 28 DOJ advised EIP that it would not concur on their motion to intervene and would not enter into a common interest agreement with EIP which EIP had requested as *quid pro quo* to stay the filing of their motion. Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

## Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

## **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

**Nonresponsive based on revised scope**